

E-filed: 12/29/2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
U.S.A.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-00334 RMW

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT No. 4 OF NON-
INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE
OF EQUIVALENTS

[Re Docket Nos. 2409, 2461]

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-02298 RMW

[Re Docket Nos. 1252, 1283]

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT No. 4 OF NON-INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF
EQUIVALENTS

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and
MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS,
INC.

Defendants.

No. C-06-00244 RMW

[Re Docket Nos. 1495, 1523]

Rambus has accused the Manufacturers¹ of infringing various patents. Trial is scheduled for January 19, 2009. Pursuant to a case management deadline for filing summary judgment motions, the Manufacturers have moved for summary judgment of non-infringement pursuant to the doctrine of equivalents based on Rambus's inability to prove such infringement. The Manufacturers have also filed a related evidentiary motion, and Rambus opposes both motions. The court has reviewed the papers and deemed this matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. Civil L.R. 7-1(b). For the following reasons, the court grants the motion for summary judgment and denies the evidentiary motion as moot.

Rambus relies on the report of its technical expert, Robert Murphy, to avoid summary judgment on its claims of infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. The report spans 132 pages and discloses Mr. Murphy's opinions that various products infringe Rambus's asserted claims. *See generally* Decl. of Sven Raz, *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.*, C-05-00334, Docket No. 2425, Ex. 7 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2008) ("Murphy Report"). With respect to the doctrine of equivalents, Mr. Murphy states in a footnote:

I understand that even if claim limitations are not met literally, that a claim limitation can be met if the accused product is insubstantially different with respect to that limitation or performs substantially the same function in substantially the same way to achieve substantially the same result. In my opinion, the claim limitations are met, and even pretending for a moment that certain limitations were not met, I already have provided my opinion as to the function, way, and result of certain limitations in previous reports or declarations such as my declaration in support of

¹ The court collectively refers to the Hynix, Micron, Nanya, and Samsung entities in this suit as "the Manufacturers."

Rambus's opposition to the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement, which I understand is Docket No. 657. Certain of these limitations are carried over into Accused Products. I incorporate in this report those opinions as to those limitations and my opinion is that the accused products have elements that perform substantially the same function in substantially the same way to achieve substantially the same result, per the same analysis.

Id. at 90, fn. 70. This footnote is the only reference in the 132 pages of Mr. Murphy's report to infringement under the doctrine of equivalents.

The only material clearly incorporated into Mr. Murphy's report is that from the declaration filed as docket number 657 (hereinafter "Murphy DOE Decl.").² Rambus clarifies that it intends to rely on the opinions disclosed on pages 41-61 of the declaration. Opp'n at 7. In those pages, Mr. Murphy explained why he believed the Manufacturers' products would infringe Rambus's claims under the doctrine of equivalents if the court were to adopt the Manufacturers' proposed constructions of various claim terms. He began by explaining how the function/way/result test would be met if the court adopted the Manufacturers' proposed construction of "device" that included a multiplexing limitation. Murphy DOE Decl. ¶¶ 137-44. He next explained how the function/way/result test would be met if the court adopted the construction of the "transaction" terms that incorporated a packet-based limitation. *Id.* ¶¶ 145-50. Finally, he explained why he believed the accused devices still infringed under the doctrine of equivalents if the court construed the "clocking" terms to include an early clock/late clock limitation. *Id.* ¶¶ 151-56.

In other words, Mr. Murphy's incorporated declaration is useless. Under the proper construction of the claims, Mr. Murphy believes there is direct infringement – not infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. *See* Murphy Report at 90, fn. 70. "Pretending for a moment" that there is not direct infringement because a claim limitation has not been met, Mr. Murphy's incorporated opinions are not helpful because they purport to explain how the Manufacturers' products accomplish the same function as a device using a multiplexed bus, transaction requests sent in request packets, or clock signals created by an early clock/late clock scheme. The incorporated

² Mr. Murphy's vague reference to "previous reports or declarations" is not sufficient to provide a "complete statement" of any additional opinion contained in those materials given the large body of his "previous reports or declarations." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. (26(a)(2)(B)(i).

1 opinions do not explain how the equivalent of any of the *actual* claim limitations can be found in the
2 Manufacturers' accused products.

3 To oppose the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment, Rambus has the burden of
4 producing "particularized testimony and linking argument on a limitation-by-limitation basis that
5 create[s] a genuine issue of material fact as to equivalents." *AquaTex Industries, Inc. v. Techniche*
6 *Solutions*, 479 F.3d 1320, 1328-29 (Fed. Cir. 2007). The Federal Circuit clearly emphasizes that
7 such testimony must "(on a limitation-by-limitation basis) describe[] the claim limitations and
8 establish[] that those skilled in the art would recognize the equivalents." *Id.* at 1329. Rambus has
9 failed to produce any such evidence.

10 Rambus points out that Mr. Murphy's report contains a lengthy discussion of the accused
11 products and how their various features function. While true, this is not sufficient because Mr.
12 Murphy does not compare or explain the equivalence between any particular feature and a limitation
13 of an asserted patent claim. The only case Rambus cites, *Cornell Research Foundation, Inc. v.*
14 *Hewlett-Packard Co.*, is not to the contrary. *See* 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89637, *86 (N.D.N.Y.
15 2007). In that case, the expert did not "incant" the common function/way/result test for determining
16 infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. *Id.* The expert did, however, "outline[] in
17 considerable detailed the similarities between the '115 patent claims and the accused processors,
18 comparing the two in relation to the method for detecting essential dependencies, the function of the
19 dispatch stack in carrying out the desired detection of instructions free of data dependencies, and the
20 manner in which it was done." *Id.* at *84-*85. In other words, the report "closely mimics the
21 function-way-result analysis[.]" *Id.* at *85. Mr. Murphy's report presents the opposite problem of
22 the expert's in *Cornell*. He has incanted the magic words (once, in a footnote), but left out the
23 analysis that compares each limitation of a claim to the accused product and explains why the two
24 are equivalent.

25 Rambus also argues that the Manufacturers "should not now be heard to criticize Rambus or
26 Mr. Murphy" for their failure to elicit Mr. Murphy's opinions about the doctrine of equivalents at
27 Mr. Murphy's deposition. Rambus cites no legal basis for denying a motion for summary judgment

28 ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT No. 4 OF NON-INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF
EQUIVALENTS

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

on such grounds, and there is none. It is not the Manufacturers' responsibility to produce the evidence of Mr. Murphy's opinions – it is Rambus's.

Finally, there is the matter of Rambus's failure to comply with the Patent Local Rules. The Patent Local Rules governing these cases require a patentee to disclose "[w]hether each element of each asserted claim is claimed to be literally present or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused Instrumentality." Patent L.R. 3-1(d); 3-6(a). Rambus's Final Infringement Contentions fall far short of this requirement with respect to the doctrine of equivalents. *See generally* Decl. of Theodore G. Brown, III, *Rambus*, Docket No. 2469-3, Ex. N (N.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2008). Rambus's sole recognition of this duty is to note that "[t]o the extent that any limitation is found to be not literally present, Rambus asserts that such limitation is present under the doctrine of equivalents." *Id.* at 10. The Patent Local Rules require a limitation-by-limitation analysis, not a boilerplate reservation. The doctrine of equivalents exists to prevent "a fraud on the patent." *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.*, 339 U.S. 605, 608 (1950). It is not designed to give a patentee a second shot at proving infringement "[t]o the extent that any limitation is found to be not literally present." Rambus's failure to comply with the Patent Local Rules (again, *see* Docket No. 2307 (Sept. 29, 2008) (striking GDDR5 contentions)) provides ample, alternative justification for dismissing Rambus's claims of infringement under the doctrine of equivalents.

For the foregoing reasons, the court grants the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment no. 4. The court denies the Manufacturers' *Daubert* motion to preclude Mr. Murphy from testifying regarding the doctrine of equivalents as moot.

DATED: 12/29/2008



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

Notice of this document has been electronically sent to counsel in:

C-05-00334, C-05-02298, C-06-00244.

Counsel	Email	Appearances:		
		05-00334	05-02298	06-00244
Elpida:				
Eric R. Lamison	elamison@kirkland.com	x		
Hynix:				
Theodore G. Brown , III	tgbrown@townsend.com	x	x	x
Karin Morgan Cogbill	kfrenza@thelen.com , pawilson@thelen.com	x		x
Daniel J. Furniss	djfurniss@townsend.com	x		
Joseph A. Greco	jagreco@townsend.com	x		
Julie Jinsook Han	JJHan@townsend.com	x	x	x
Tomomi Katherine Harkey	tharkey@omm.com	x		
Jordan Trent Jones	jtjones@townsend.com	x		
Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com	x		
Kenneth Lee Nissly	kennissly@omm.com	x		x
Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke	korourke@omm.com	x		
Belinda Martinez Vega	bvega@omm.com	x	x	x
Geoffrey Hurdall Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com	x	x	x
Susan Gregory van Keulen	svankeulen@omm.com	x		x
Interdigital:				
Nathan Loy Walker	nathan.walker@wilmerhale.com	x		
Micron:				
Robert Jason Becher	robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com	x		x
John D Beynon	john.beynon@weil.com	x	x	x
Jared Bobrow	jared.bobrow@weil.com	x	x	x
Yonaton M Rosenzweig	yonirosenzweig@quinnemanuel.com	x		x
Harold Avrum Barza	halbarza@quinnemanuel.com			x
Linda Jane Brewer	lindabrewer@quinnemanuel.com			x
Aaron Bennett Craig	aaroncraig@quinnemanuel.com			x
Leeron Kalay	kalay@fr.com			x
David J. Lender	david.lender@weil.com			x
Rachael Lynn Ballard McCracken	rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com			x
Sven Raz	sven.raz@weil.com			x
David J. Ruderman	davidruderman@quinnemanuel.com			x
Elizabeth Stotland Weiswasser	elizabeth.weiswasser@weil.com			x
Nanya:				
Jason Sheffield Angell	jangell@orrick.com	x	x	x
Kristin Sarah Cornuelle	kcornuelle@orrick.com	x	x	x
Chester Wren-Ming Day	cday@orrick.com	x		
Jan Ellen Ellard	jellard@orrick.com	x		x
Vickie L. Feeman	vfeeman@orrick.com	x	x	x
Robert E. Freitas	rfreitas@orrick.com	x		
Craig R. Kaufman	hlee@orrick.com	x		
Hao Li	hli@orrick.com	x		

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT No. 4 OF NON-INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1	Cathy Yunshan Lui	clui@orrick.com	x		
	Theresa E. Norton	tnorton@orrick.com	x		
2	Mark Shean	mshean@orrick.com	x		
	Kaiwen Tseng	ktseng@orrick.com	x		
3	Rambus:				
4	Kathryn Kalb Anderson	Kate.Anderson@mto.com	x		x
	Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com	x	x	x
5	Erin C. Dougherty	erin.dougherty@mto.com	x	x	x
	Sean Eskovitz	sean.eskovitz@mto.com	x	x	x
6	Burton Alexander Gross	Burton.Gross@mto.com	x	x	x
	Keith Rhoderic Dhu Hamilton, II	keith.hamilton@mto.com	x	x	x
7	Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com	x	x	x
	Andrea Jill Weiss Jeffries	Andrea.Jeffries@mto.com	x	x	x
8	Miriam Kim	Miriam.Kim@mto.com	x	x	x
	Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	carolyn.luedtke@mto.com	x	x	x
9	Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com	x	x	x
10	Jennifer Lynn Polse	jen.polse@mto.com	x	x	x
	Matthew Thomas Powers	mpowers@sidley.com	x		
11	Rollin Andrew Ransom	rransom@sidley.com	x	x	x
	Rosemarie Theresa Ring	rose.ring@mto.com	x	x	x
12	Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com	x	x	x
	Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com	x	x	x
13	Donald Ward	Bill.Ward@mto.com	x	x	x
	David C. Yang	david.yang@mto.com	x	x	x
14	Douglas A. Cawley	dcawley@mckoolsmith.com			x
	Scott L Cole	scole@mckoolsmith.com			x
15	Samsung:				
16	Steven S. Cherensky	steven.cherensky@weil.com	x	x	
	Claire Elise Goldstein	claire.goldstein@weil.com	x	x	
17	Dana Prescott Kenned Powers	dana.powers@weil.com	x	x	x
18	Matthew Douglas Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com , matthew.antonelli@weil.com	x	x	
19	Edward Robert Reines	Edward.Reines@weil.com	x	x	
20	Texas Instruments:				
	Kelli A. Crouch	kcrouch@jonesday.com	x	x	x

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program in each action.

Dated: 12/29/2008

TSF
Chambers of Judge Whyte

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT No. 4 OF NON-INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

C-05-00334 RMW; C-05-02298-RMW; C-06-00244-RMW

TSF